

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Messrs. PAUL, SPRATT, JEFFERSON, HALL of Texas, and STENHOLM changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments to the bill, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1775) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 179, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1775, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1775, the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to correct such things as spelling, punctuation, cross-referencing and section numbering.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1775, the bill just considered and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

A TALE OF TWO WOMEN

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues a letter I received from a constituent of mine from Sparks, NV. This letter tells a story of two women. The first, and author of this letter, works 60 hours or more a week in hopes of saving enough money to get married and have children. The second woman, her cousin, has three children and has been receiving welfare for 13 years. The closing paragraph of her letter sums up the state of things better than I have ever heard. She writes, "Yes, the liberals take good care of people like my cousin who were smarter than I by deciding to have children, not get married and not go to work so that the Federal Government would take care of her and her children. I was the stupid one, who worked hard and waited to get married before having children. Now my taxes and hard work help pay for my cousin to enjoy her life."

The Republican tax reduction will help restore common sense and accountability to the process and lift the burden off the shoulders of the hard-working, tax-paying men and women of America.

JULY 1, 1997.

Congressman JIM GIBBONS,
Reno, NV.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS: I thought you might enjoy reading about how Clinton and the liberals have proved they are pro family. This is a tale of two women.

One is 37 years old and has worked since she was 14 years old busing tables at a Holiday Inn. The other woman is 30 and has never had a regular job in her life but she has received welfare assistance since she was 17.

The 37 year old recently got married for the first time, became a first time home buyer and has no children. The 30 year old has never been married, lives with her current boyfriend and has three children.

The 37 year old owns a car that is 10 years old and only seats two people. Her husband has a 9 year old pick up truck which also only seats two. They would like to purchase a moderately priced used four door car to carry children that they plan to have. The 30 year old recently bought a new Toyota Camry.

The 37 year old and her husband now pay more taxes since they got married and the 30 year old pays no taxes.

When the 30 year old and her husband have children they will not qualify for the proposed \$500 tax credit per child because they make a little more than \$75,000 per year on a combined income and are considered rich. The 30 year old will receive a \$500 per child tax credit even though she does not pay taxes.

The 37 year old recently took a second job at \$6.75/hour and her husband works as much overtime as he can to help pay off debt associated with buying the new house so she can afford a new car and have children. The 37 year old woman works 60+ hours a week and sees her husband 1 day a week and in passing during the rest of the week. The 30 year old has lots of free time, as her mother and sisters take turns baby-sitting the three children, while she goes out with her friends and spends time with her boyfriend.

When the 30 year old loses her welfare, she plans to take a job but her child care will be paid for by the government. The 37 year old will have to quit her job to take care of children, when she has them, because child care will eat up most of her salary so she has decided it would be better to stay home.

The 37 year old is myself and the 30 year old is my cousin who had her first child at 17 because her older sister had a child and received more attention.

I make \$28,500 per year as a marketing coordinator for an engineering firm. I have worked hard all my adult life and put myself through college. My husband's base salary is about \$36,000 per year as a postal worker (for 16 years) but he works a lot of overtime and averages about \$47,000 per year. We bring home about \$48,000 per year. We both have some money withheld for retirement. When we did our taxes last year we discovered that we are considered to be wealthy (because of our combined incomes) and should therefore pay more taxes.

We were penalized for working hard and getting married.

Now we find that we cannot afford to have children. If we have children, I will probably have to quit my job to take care of them because day care would cost about \$7,800 per year for one child and I don't have relatives nearby who could care for them and I don't qualify for assistance by the federal government to help pay for day care.

But I guess quitting my job would be okay because I would then qualify for the \$500 per child tax credit because our family income would be under \$75,000 per year. Of course we wouldn't have a car that we would all fit in. But at least the child would be safe in the front seat of both vehicles since they don't have air bags.

My husband would have to give up his 401K because we would need that extra income too. But that would be okay since we will now have the federal government to take care of us when we get old.

So now, we will be penalized for having children.

Yes, Clinton and his liberals take good care of people like my cousin who was smarter than I by deciding to have children, not get married and not work so the federal government would take care of her and her children.

I was the stupid one, who worked hard and waited to get married before having children.

Now my taxes and hard work help pay for my cousin to enjoy her life.

Yes, Clinton is pro family.

Sincerely,

SHELLEY READ,
Sparks, Nevada.

□ 2130

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.